

**PLEASE NOTE:** therefore the status information that is ultimately triggering the alarm response here comes from an appliance whose primary function is NOT security.

Basset shows a network where there are appliances 25, 30, 35, 40, 45, 65. The appliances communicate with the network via the AIM devices 70-74 & 78. Only one of these appliances relates to security, i.e. 40. The appliances share a controller 15.

The Examiner states that col. 14, lines 53-64 of Basset teaches using alarms and security systems for communicating to effect a control of the appliances. This is in the sense that perhaps a fire might be detected by a unit such as 40 and then a utility might be called by a second unit such as 45. Therefore, in Basset, if there is any status information coming from an appliance and resulting in an alarm, that status is coming from appliance 40 whose primary function is security. This fails to teach or suggest the limitation of claim 17 that the status information that results in the alarm is coming from an appliance whose primary function is NOT security.

Moreover, the Examiner has failed to indicate what if any part of Basset is supposedly an alarm activation processor. The alarm is in fact activated by the units 40/73. Controller 15 and telephone wiring 45 merely serve a communication function. But, if the status information is provided by the units 40/73, then how can they also be alarm activation processors? Separate claim limitations cannot be read on the same unit.

Rietkerk is added as allegedly correcting deficiencies of Basset; however, this rejection is not understood, because a number of aspects of Rietkerk are misinterpreted by the Examiner. The Examiner says that 112 and 113 are alarm activation processors. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Rietkerk clearly states at column 5, lines 43-53 that 112 and 113 are only sensors, not processors. The Examiner says that sensors 112 and 113 receive status information from RF unit 117; however, again column 5, lines 43-53 clearly state that the RF unit 117 receives information

FROM the sensors 112 and 113, not vice versa. The RF unit only communicates the alarm information externally. Accordingly, due to these misinterpretations of the reference, Applicant is not able to understand why Rietkerk corrects any deficiencies of Basset.

In any case, in Rietkerk, any status information that triggers an alarm is coming from sensors 112 and 113 whose primary function is security. There is no status information triggering an alarm that comes from an appliance whose primary function is NOT security, as required by claim 17.

Accordingly, Rietkerk and Basset are similarly deficient in failing to show an alarm effected in response to a status report that comes from an appliance whose primary function is NOT security. Claim 17 therefore distinguishes patentably over these references.

Claim 26 is analogous to claim 17.

#### Claim 18

The Examiner states that Rietkerk's appliance 107 contains an alarm activation processor. Where? As far as Applicant can tell, any alarm activation occurs within the unit 101, not within the protected asset 107. Figure 2 clearly shows the APD 102 as being external to the PC 107, not integrated within it.

#### Claim 29

Claim 29 is not analogous to claim 17. Claim 29 recites

- an appliance component that is configured to effect a primary function independent of security;

- an interface to a network that facilitates a control of the appliance component via communications on the network, and
- an alarm activation processor that is configured to effect an alarm response dependent on the status received from a status report of an other appliance via the network.

**PLEASE NOTE:** The appliance has a primary function that is not security. The appliance also has an alarm activation processor. The status report that triggers the alarm here is from another appliance.

There is no teaching or suggestion of anything like this in the references. The Examiner has failed to indicate in the references any appliance whose primary function is NOT security, which also has an alarm activation processor, and which receives a status report from **ANOTHER** appliance.

Accordingly, claim 29 recites different and additional patentable distinctions over the references when compared with claim 17.

### Claims 21-23

The necessity of combining three references against these claims gives rise to an inference of non-obviousness.

### Claim 21

The rejection is not understood.

First the Examiner refers to column 14, lines 37-54 and column 15, lines 23-35 of Rietkerk, which is in the claim section, not the description section; moreover, the cited sections start in the middle of claim recitation clauses in an incomprehensible way. Then the Examiner

refers to references (C) and (B), but Applicant is not able to locate any such reference letters in Rietkerk. What is the Examiner talking about here?

Then the Examiner refers to Hall, which is a document having 12 sheets of drawing and 22 columns of specification and claims, BUT the Examiner fails to indicate what part of Hall is being discussed.

Applicant respectfully submits that this rejection completely fails to comply with the requirements of 37 CFR 1.104.

#### Claim 22

This claim specifically recites a second alarm response dependent on a status of a second appliance. This is supplemental to the alarm response of independent claim 17, which alarm response is dependent on the status of a first appliance.

If the Examiner is intending Hall's statement "I am missing" to be an alarm response, then only one such alarm response is indicated in col. 14, lines 37-54 of Hall. The "I am missing" might be based on reaching more than one external device, but there is only one response. There is no second response.

Accordingly, the cited sections of Hall fail to teach or suggest claim 22.

#### Claims 23 and 25

Claim 23 recites first and second rule bases.

For these limitations, the Examiner points to Rietkerk, col. 4, lines 23-29 and col. 5, lines 42-67. These sections indicate that alarm signals may have different signal characteristics and that these may be interpreted and decoded. The sections fail to indicate what mechanism might

be used for this. Interpreting and decoding signals might occur through any number of mechanisms. Rule bases are not normally thought of for this purpose. Enclosed please find an Internet definition of "rule base" from [searchnetworking.techtarget.com](http://searchnetworking.techtarget.com).

Claim 25 also has a "rule base" limitation and is therefore patentable for analogous reasons.

#### Claims 24 and 31

These claims recite that the alarm response is in further dependence on an area status. In other words the alarm response is dependent on BOTH the status report AND the area status.

Against this recitation the Examiner cites Le Van Suu. This reference has a motion detector to detect security problems. However, there is no teaching or suggestion of how such a detector might give information to an alarm activation processor that is already getting status information from another source; or how two such disparate pieces of information might be used together. It is only through impermissible hindsight in view of Applicant's disclosure of a rule base approach that the Examiner could come up with such a combination.

Any other rejections would appear to be moot in view of the above.

This Page Is Inserted by IFW Operations  
and is not a part of the Official Record

## **BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES**

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images may include (but are not limited to):

- BLACK BORDERS
- TEXT CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
- FADED TEXT
- ILLEGIBLE TEXT
- SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
- COLORED PHOTOS
- BLACK OR VERY BLACK AND WHITE DARK PHOTOS
- GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS

**IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.**

**As rescanning documents *will not* correct images,  
please do not report the images to the  
Image Problems Mailbox.**